

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-14 were pending in this application, and they treated as follows in the Office Action dated April 14, 2003:

- Claim 3 was objected to because of informalities;
- Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter;
- Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bethune et al.;
- Claims 1-14 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Omizo;
- Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al. in view of Wojnarowski et al.;
- Claims 5-8, 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al. in view of Naoi et al.; and
- Claims 9-11, 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al. in view of Naoi et al. and Yamada et al.

To the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-8 and 12 have been cancelled. Claims 9-11 and 13-14 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 9-11 and 13-14 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the recited elements and to correct errors associated with translation. As recited, Applicants believe claim 9 is no longer anticipated or rendered obvious by any prior art references of record, singly or in combination. Specifically, Applicants submit that the masking member 13 of Yamada et al. is provided between the laser generator and the surface to be decorated (see FIG. 1 of Yamada et al.) for adjusting the intensity of laser, and this is not used for preventing ink or paint from overreaching. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 9 is now in condition for allowance. Since each of claims 10-11 and 13-14 includes every element and limitation of claim 9, each of them is also believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing all of the pending claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.


SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-770-7900

Date: August 11, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

MIMURA ET AL.

By:


Michael D. Bednarek
Registration No. 44,615

PCC/mvj